



Looking for 'the International' beyond the West

Pinar Bilgin

To cite this article: Pinar Bilgin (2010) Looking for 'the International' beyond the West, Third World Quarterly, 31:5, 817-828, DOI: [10.1080/01436597.2010.502696](https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2010.502696)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2010.502696>



Published online: 01 Sep 2010.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 849



Citing articles: 4 View citing articles [↗](#)

Review Article

Looking for ‘the International’ beyond the West

PINAR BILGIN

International Relations in South Asia: Search for an Alternative Paradigm

Navnita Chadha Behera (ed)
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008

International Relations Scholarship around the World: Worlding Beyond the West

Arlene B Tickner & Ole Wæver (eds)
New York: Routledge, 2009

Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and Beyond Asia

Amitav Acharya & Barry Buzan (eds)
New York: Routledge, 2010

This review article covers three recent edited volumes that share an interest in looking beyond the West to see how ‘the international’ is imagined, conceived and practised in other parts of the world. Arlene B Tickner and Ole Wæver’s study is global in coverage, while Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan’s book focuses on Asia, and Navnita Chadha Behera’s on South Asia. Considering the world’s current population—just under seven billion—what is under consideration in these three volumes are approaches to ‘the international’ by a majority of the world’s current populace. For even the least comprehensive of the three volumes covers a significant portion, with South Asia being home to roughly two billion of the four billion people living in Asia.

Not that the reader can always tell by the tone of some of the chapters. Notwithstanding significant exceptions, several contributions to all three volumes are structured around an *absence vis-à-vis* their respective geographies—an absence of IR scholarship immediately recognisable to readers of US-authored textbooks. This is somewhat unanticipated, for these collections, at least in the way they are set up in their respective introductory

Pinar Bilgin is in the Department of International Relations, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. Email: pbilgin@bilkent.edu.tr

chapters, are designed to remedy another absence—that of insight into the study of ‘the international’ beyond the West. Needless to say, these two are strikingly different stances on the subject. Whereas the former laments incongruity between the story of IR as told by US-authored textbooks and the stories produced by non-Western scholars, the latter seeks to uncover non-Western approaches to ‘the international’—the assumption being that there is more to this than meets the eye of the reader of a US-authored textbook. The 42 contributions to these three volumes could be situated on a continuum somewhere between these two stances on how ‘the international’ is imagined, conceived and practised in and beyond the West.

In what follows the essay introduces the three volumes, highlights their distinctive contributions and discusses the aforementioned tension that runs through them in terms of its implications for the future of the study of ‘the international’. Let me begin by locating these three volumes in the broader context of growing scholarly interest in the study of ‘the international’ in different parts of the world.

Latest literature on the study of ‘the international’: two axes

Recent decades have witnessed growing interest in the study of International Relations around the world. Such interest has developed around two main axes. The first axis, American IR versus the rest, is formed by divergent responses to the question of whether IR is still ‘an American Social Science’. Originally raised by Stanley Hoffman in his *Daedalus* article,¹ the study of ‘the international’ having been shaped as an ‘American social science’ has been problematised by several scholars in different ways. Hayward R Alker and Thomas J Biersteker’s *International Studies Quarterly* article, ‘The dialectics of world order: notes for a future archaeologist of international savoir faire’ pointed to US parochialism as a problem.² KJ Holsti’s book longed for a more cohesive IR in terms of basic questions and approaches—but not a ‘grand theory’ in the American social science tradition.³ More recent engagement with this question has included successive articles by Steve Smith and Ole Wæver, and Robert A Crawford and Darryl S Jarvis’s edited book.⁴ These studies, too, differed in terms of their assessment of the extent and nature of US dominance in the study of the international. Steve Smith echoed Hoffman’s concern that ‘the study of international relations was dominated by the US academic community in much the same way as the US dominated world politics’ and further maintained that this dominance took the form of a ‘a specific view of how to create knowledge’ that, in turn, constructed a ‘specific world of international relations, and that world is one that is decidedly ethnocentric’.⁵ Ole Wæver, on the other hand, emphasised that, along with hegemony, came insularity.⁶ As American IR severed its ties with European political theory and increasingly came to rest on a specific epistemology, argued Wæver, it moved further away from European IR, with the latter progressing in accord with its own dynamics.

It is more recently that scholarly literature has come to be structured around a second axis, Western IR versus the rest. Whereas previous debates

were mostly about differences between 'British versus American' or 'European versus American' approaches,⁷ this time the issue of IR's parochialism was raised in terms of the discipline's 'Western' character—thus lumping Europe together with the USA. Writing in 1996, the 75th anniversary of the world's first department of International Politics at Aberystwyth, Ken Booth (1996: 330) wondered 'what...would the subject look like today...if, instead of being founded by a wealthy Liberal MP in Wales (and those like him elsewhere in the Anglo-American world) what if the subject's origins had derived from the life and work of the admirable black, feminist, medic, she-chief of the Zulus, Dr Zungu?'.⁸

Since then, scholars have increasingly problematised the 'Westernness' of IR—but in different ways. Whereas some have asked what a less parochial and/or less peripheral IR would look like and put the challenge in terms of 'thinking past Western IR' (the title of a panel convened by Mustapha Kamal Pasha at the Chicago International Studies Association (ISA) in 2008),⁹ others have been content with surveying the state of the field outside the 'Western' core. Anna M Agathangelou and LHM Ling's article, 'The house of IR: from family power politics to the *Poisies* of worldism' did the former, revealing the structure of the discipline as a 'colonial household', thus highlighting 'its structural intimacy with capitalist-patriarchy'.¹⁰ The article offered *Poisies* as 'an alternative epistemology to understand, critique, engage with, and reconstruct international relations'. The *Journal of International Relations and Development*, the in-house journal of the Central and Eastern European International Studies Association, has published fine examples of the latter, taking stock of the study of the international in its own region, including a special forum in 2009,¹¹ among others.¹² Contributions structured around this second axis have mostly been informed by postcolonial studies, as with Chan *et al*'s edited volume Inayatullah and Blaney's monograph and Jones' edited book.¹³ A number of edited journal issues or special forum sections of journals has also focused on this theme.¹⁴

The three volumes under consideration here have been fed by and in turn have fed into this growing interest in the study of 'the international' in different parts of the world. There is now a global body of authors who think and write about issues tied up with IR's parochialism and ethnocentrism, and its causes and consequences in and beyond the West. The overlap between the contributors of the books also attests to this: Acharya, Behera and Inoguchi have chapters in all three volumes. While some of these authors have been part of the debates since the late 1970s (as with Korany and Biersteker,¹⁵ both contributors to Tickner and Wæver), some others (including myself¹⁶) have begun reflecting on the subject following the editors' invitation and/or encouragement. Tickner and Wæver's book was conceived as a three-volume study and launched at the 2004 Montreal ISA convention as a workshop and panel series entitled 'geocultural epistemologies'. As the editors explain in their introduction, the participants have met several times over the years and presented at panels and contributed to the growth of the literature I have sketched out above. Acharya and Buzan's collection first came out as a special issue of *International Relations of the*

Asia Pacific in 2007 and was then expanded and turned into an edited volume. Behera notes in the introduction to her own collection that it was Acharya who invited her in 2003 to organise the first Asian Political Science and International Studies Association (APISA) Regional Workshop for South Asia, which she then turned into an edited volume (p vii). The point being, these three volumes represent a noteworthy change in both the pace and substance of scholarly reflections on the study of ‘the international’ in and beyond the West.

The books

In the ways they were set up by their respective editors, the three volumes under consideration here differ in terms of how they see the international beyond the West, and its future. Given the limits of space, I will focus on the central question/agenda set by each editor(s)’ and contributors’ divergent responses.

Acharya and Buzan, and ‘why is there no non-Western international theory?’

The editors Acharya and Buzan introduce their volume as pursuing twin goals of ‘introducing non-Western IR traditions to a Western IR audience’ and ‘challenging non-Western IR thinkers to challenge the dominance of Western IR theory’. This is sought to be accomplished by steering a select group of authors from Asia (including China, Japan, Korea, India, Indonesia, Southeast Asia as a sub-region, and ‘Islam’ as a cultural zone) to engage in four tasks: 1) to present a survey of IR thinking in their geography; 2) to evaluate the impact of Western IR theory in terms of understanding the international; 3) to evaluate it in terms of its impact on the study of IR in their own geography; and 4) to consider whether indigenous approaches to the international exist, and to what degree they constitute a fitting alternative. The end result is a survey of IR studies in Asia that starts from and comes back to the question: why is there no international theory in Asia? As such, compared to the other two, Acharya and Buzan’s volume is more explicitly structured around the aforementioned absence, in Asia, of IR immediately recognisable to readers of US-authored textbooks. That said, the volume is also concerned with the misfit between the story as told in such textbooks and the world as experienced in Asia.

In their introductory chapter the editors rephrase Martin Wight’s (1960) question, ‘why is there no international theory?’,¹⁷ and ask: ‘why is there no non-Western international theory?’. Wight’s question was rhetorical in that, as the editors remind us, he thought theories about domestic politics were theories of ‘good life’ whereas the international was the realm of violent conflict and war—phenomena that impede good life. Hence the absence of theory on the international, Wight argued. Currently, the editors argue, it is the Western world where (and on which) theories of good life are produced, whereas life in the non-Western world is characterised by violent conflict and war. The international for the non-West, in other words, continues to be

about bare survival. This is not to suggest that the editors offer this parallel in lieu of an explanation for the absence of non-Western international theory. Rather they invoke Wight's question in an attempt to provoke readers into reflecting on the aforementioned absence. Yet one cannot help but notice how drawing such a parallel (between the pursuit of good life in the domestic arena during Wight's time and pursuit of good life in the West in the present time) ends up betraying a vision of 'good life' that remains untouched by a gender perspective—the personal is political, the personal is international, in Cynthia Enloe's (re)phrase¹⁸—that highlights experiences of not-so-good-life which remain untouched by the very same theories. What is more, as RBJ Walker's (1993) take on Wight's question underscored,¹⁹ it is partly (but not wholly) the ways in which we have come to think about and practice the international (outside) that has allowed for 'good life' in the domestic realm (inside). Neither the editors nor the contributors dwell on the possibility of such a relationship existing between theories of good life in the Western world and their absence in the non-West.

In its stead, they ask a different question: why is it that non-Western scholars, notwithstanding a misfit between Western IR theory and non-Western experiences, do not pursue their own theories? Acharya and Buzan find this all the more puzzling given their Coxian (1981) convictions:²⁰ 'theory is always *for* someone and *for* some purpose'. Surely, they suggest, Asian states would be interested in having their own theories to serve their own purposes and scholars would be expected to rise to the occasion. Individual accounts by the contributors suggest that, notwithstanding such wishes by Asian states, scholars are yet to produce indigenous IR theory.²¹ What seems to be happening is more of the same, report the contributors: atheoretical products with some degree of increase in theory testing. Given that the theories being tested are Western-originated, the aforementioned absence remains.

With regard to the question of whether alternative approaches to the international exist, among the contributors to Acharya and Buzan's volume, Yaqing Qin gives the most explicit response (but see also Chaesung Chun and Behera in the same volume). He maintains that the break with the past, brought about by experiences of defeat and colonisation, has rendered it impossible to have continuity. He writes:

The Chinese saw a great discontinuity of their intellectual culture when the West met the East. As the Chinese culture with Confucianism at its core was confronted and defeated at the turn of the twentieth century, the belief system contained in it disintegrated accordingly. This made the Chinese to reflect on their culture from inside...In such a context, no matter what you theorize about, its soul is Western. Therefore no distinct Chinese school of IR theory, as well as any other social theory, can be established. (p 38)

Needless to say, not all contributors are in agreement with Qin on this subject. Yet the editors join his scepticism *vis-à-vis* postcolonial studies. In particular, they do not consider postcolonial studies an 'authentic'

alternative because, they write, 'it is basically framed within cultural discourse originating from the West' (p 16). Yet it is not entirely clear to what extent the alternative proposed by Acharya and Buzan, that of 'constitutive localisation' of concepts and theories, is different from what Edward Said has written about the life cycle of a theory as it travels from one geography to another,²² or what other postcolonial theorists have studied under 'vernacularisation'. The other two volumes are more certain about the potential and/or actual contribution of postcolonial studies to thinking about the international beyond the West.

Tickner and Wæver, and 'Worlding beyond the West'

'Worlding beyond the West' is the title of the book series edited by Ticker and Wæver, of which the volume under consideration is the first. The editors use the term 'worlding' in a way very much akin to its use in gender studies, as the attempt to 'invoke a situation in which we live as neither homogenized and global, nor separate and local, but place-based yet transnational' (p 9). As such, the editors underscore 'the situatedness of knowledge and experience in relation to the dominant reading of globalization' (p 10).

Tickner and Wæver explicitly seek to resist organising their effort around the aforementioned absence. In their introductory chapter they highlight how efforts at surveying IR beyond the West, when done 'without a concrete study of non-dominant and non-privileged parts of the world...becomes yet another way of speaking from the centre about the whole, and of depicting the centre as normal and the periphery as a projected "other" through which the disciplinary core is reinforced' (p 1). The editors consider the following as a way out:

In order to transcend this state of affairs, it is necessary to actually know about the ways in which IR is practiced around the world, and to identify the concrete mechanisms shaping the field in distinct geocultural sites, a knowledge effort which must use theories drawn from sociology (and history) of science, post-colonialism, and several other fields (p 1).

The volume is explicitly designed towards this end, with all geocultural settings accounted for—some in greater detail, others in more broad-brush lines—depending on the availability of interested scholars. Needless to say, the availability of interested scholars says something about the state of the study of the international in those parts of the world and that specific scholarly field's openness to self-evaluation and self-reflection. Geographies covered by the Tickner and Wæver volume include Latin America, South Africa, Africa, Japan, Korea and Taiwan, China, Southeast Asia, Iran, Arab countries, Israel, Turkey, Russia, Central and Eastern Europe, Western Europe, the Anglo world, and the US.

The question is: having read the first truly global survey of the study of the international in different parts of the world, are we a step closer to 'transcending' a body of theory that, notwithstanding the parochial and

peripheral nature of the knowledge it provides, has nevertheless enjoyed lasting hegemony? There is no easy answer to this question. That said, one of the important contributions of the Tickner and Wæver volume is the way in which it helps problematise the categories through which we have made sense of such hegemony. Hoffman's 1977 article is cited by almost all authors for what its title immediately brings to mind—US dominance in the study of International Relations.²³ However, as Biersteker's meticulous overview of publication data (in Tickner and Wæver) shows, where American IR is dominant is in terms of publications in top journals. Put differently, American IR's power is better understood as an ability to define what is 'social scientific' and therefore worth publishing in 'top' journals. Otherwise, if dominance were to be defined in terms of the assumed prevalence of rationalist approaches to the international (Smith's definition of 'hegemony' in IR), TRIP survey data has shown that at present, rationalism is not dominant even among US scholars.²⁴ As such, the answer to the question of whether IR is (still) an American social science is not an unequivocal 'yes'. But then how are we to understand the prevalence of US scholarly writings on the reading lists of universities in the US and elsewhere in the world (see Biersteker in Tickner and Wæver)? Therein lie the roots of American IR's hegemony, argue Tickner and Wæver, in the 'authority over decisions concerning what qualifies as "theory"' (p 335).

Thus we are back to the question of absence, but in a different way. What comes out of Tickner and Wæver's survey is that the 'amalgamate' kind of IR Inoguchi observes in Japan (in Acharya and Buzan, p 63) is practised in other geographies as well.²⁵ We do not always see (or recognise) it, because it does not appear in 'top' journals. However, one need not go to the other end of the world but can attend one of the ISA's regional affiliates' conferences (as with the aforementioned Central and Eastern European ISA) or the umbrella organisation, the World International Studies Congress, to see how the international is accounted for in such 'amalgamate' form in different parts of the world (some of which actually count as 'Western'). Scholars continue to communicate with each other and the international is somehow accounted for—albeit in different ways, ways that are not immediately recognisable to readers of US-authored textbooks.

The question raised by Acharya and Buzan is worth revisiting in light of Tickner and Wæver's study: why is it that non-Western scholars, notwithstanding a misfit between Western IR theory and non-Western experiences, do not produce their 'own' theories? Tickner and Wæver's response is one of resistance to respond to a question framed as such for, they argue:

... without producing much of its own IR theory and perspectives, IR 'works' in many places, but this means something markedly different than in the core. Instead of comparing it to IR in the core—and define peripheral IR in terms of what it is *not*—it is necessary to see what it *is*. To take seriously what IR *does* by doing what it does. Real existing IR in non-privileged parts of the world is a purposeful, meaningful, and socially relevant activity, only under conditions different from those in the core (p 339, emphasis in the original).

Yet, in responding to this question, it is also important to consider the fact that the site where hegemonic IR has flourished has also been the hegemon of world politics since World War II. Tickner and Wæver note how 'this influences the way our discipline sees the world and also how it contributes to policy making and thereby to the world's very shape' (p 5). The survey the rest of the book provides suggests that there may be more to the influence of US hegemony than that. It could be argued that a reason why non-Western scholars, notwithstanding a misfit between Western IR theory and non-Western experiences, do not pursue their own theories has to do with the role American IR theory plays, in that it goes beyond providing an account of how the world works.²⁶ The editors (Acharya and Buzan join Tickner and Wæver on this) assume that theory is there for purposes of explaining (and understanding) world politics. However, in some contexts, American IR theory plays a role beyond the limits of its explanatory power, because it is what *American* scholars and policy-makers use when making sense of world politics. It is not what that specific theory does (in terms of the 'job description' of a theory) but what it allows non-Western actors to do in their power struggle *vis-à-vis* other actors, given their particular geocultural setting. Put differently, American IR's authority goes beyond its explanatory capacity and becomes warranted by its political origins as well as its 'rational' basis.²⁷ For, in many settings, doing IR the American way has proven to be a way of signalling a break with the (ostensibly) 'non-rational' past and the embrace of a post-Enlightenment, 'rational' way of doing things. As such, the sociology of domestic, international and academic politics are all worth paying attention to if we are to understand the perseverance of American IR and of many non-Western scholars' hesitance to replace it in their studies.

Behera, and the search for 'an alternative paradigm'

Behera's edited volume picks up the debate from where the other two volumes leave off. It is designed to search, explicitly, for an alternative paradigm. What Behera means by 'alternative' is not Southeast Asian exceptionalism;²⁸ nor is it nativism (*à la* 'Islamisation of knowledge' entertained by Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh, in Acharya and Buzan) or creating an 'Indian/Southeast Asian school of IR'. Behera's project rejects the theoretical and ideological premises of all three and instead calls for redefining IR itself—a post-Western IR. Shibashis Chatterjee concurs as regards the futility of having local schools of IR: 'theory is supposed to be general and not bound by a given empirical setting', he writes (p 179).²⁹

Behera, as editor, sets up the problem facing such a project in terms of IR's umbilical relationship to the Southeast Asian state. The discipline has suffered as a result of this, Behera argues, because what has come to dominate (political realism) is a particular vision of IR that has helped to set up a particular kind of state and disallowed other imaginations and practices.³⁰ The contributors pick up various facets of this project and develop it further. Jayadeva Uyangoda calls for reworking the associational basis of the state so that minorities may have different relations *vis-à-vis* the

state and with each other. Mijarul Quayes points to the 'Euro-centric intellectual trap' built into our current studies and does not see a way out unless we figure out how to connect 'pre-colonial realities' to 'present day post-colonial realities' so that people can 'exercise choices'. Ganga Bahadur Thapa makes a similar case with reference to the Nepalese context and points to the problems of democratisation as rooted in such disconnect. Shibashis Chatterjee, Varun Sahni and Ayesha Siddiqi disagree on the factors that drive the India–Pakistan conflict. Whereas Chatterjee emphasises 'their mutually-exclusive nation-building strategies' following a certain model of statehood, Sahni locates the problem in India's 'structural constraints', such as nuclear deterrence, military industry and maritime security and border management, and Siddiqi in the military competition Pakistan has engaged in. Anand Aditya, Mangalika de Silva and Haider K Nizamani all engage in themes related to security, its non-military aspects and non-statist considerations.

The question remains: what does this exacting set of contributions amount to in terms of the task set by the editor—that of searching for an alternative paradigm? There is very little agreement among the contributors as to the feasibility of such a task, let alone the shape such a paradigm would or should take. Inayatullah locates himself on the more cynical end of the spectrum of contributors when he problematises the starting point of the volume: 'We look for our keys by the street lamp, not where we lost them. Our categories of the real and their representations in the world of politics make our imprisonment certain' (p 55). Chatterjee concurs: 'it is difficult to believe that there can ever be some alternative theory besides the ones we have already got' (p 179). Acharya gives voice to the more sanguine stance when he expresses his conviction that 'it is possible to make important contributions to the study of global phenomena from a regional vantage point without being unduly exceptionalist'—as with European IR (p 83). Accordingly he calls for 'developing general insights and constructs from the Asian experience to explain events and phenomena in the outside world' (p 83). Needless to say, this is not what the editor has in mind when she calls for an 'alternative paradigm'. Behera's call is not for a Southeast Asian alternative to IR that would be relevant only in Southeast Asia. Nor does she call for an alternative paradigm to compete with Western IR on the world stage. Her project is more ambitious in that she seeks to move IR beyond its Western past and present.

Conclusion

In pursuing their project of looking for 'the international' beyond the West, the editors of these three volumes are in good company. There is a growing body of literature, outlined in the first section of this essay, which seeks to do just that—albeit in different ways. On the question of feasibility a divide runs through the literature in parallel lines, yet not identical to the one here. Those who are critical of Western IR highlight similar problems—with state-centrism, statism, neglect of identity dynamics, the domestic/international

divide, the inside not being considered ‘relevant’ whereas the outside is construed as ‘anarchy’, etc. What is more they do this in terms of challenging IR in general, but not in terms of its relevance to this or that geocultural setting. Contributions to this critical IR literature are far too many to count here. Critically, they remind readers that the aforementioned problems of IR have, at some point in history, constituted solutions to some other problems and that both need considering if change is desired. Arresting examples of such complexity are found in both Walker’s (1993) (on the inside/outside divide constituting a solution to the problem of political community in the West) and Williams’ (1998) works (on the absence of identity from Western thinking emerging as a solution to violent conflicts justified with reference to identity differences).³¹ Theory is indeed ‘for someone and for some purpose’.³² Western IR has so far been for the West—not only in terms of claiming and maintaining hegemony, as many of the contributions suggest—but also in terms of constituting a solution to problems of violent conflict and political community in the West. The challenge of redefining IR towards a post-Western IR is a challenge for both Western and non-Western scholars—not merely for the latter, as it is sometimes supposed.

Notes

- 1 S Hoffman, ‘An American social science—International Relations’, *Daedalus*, 106(3), 1977, pp 41–60.
- 2 HR Alker & TJ Biersteker, ‘The dialectics of world order: notes for a future archeologist of international savoir faire’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 28(2), 1984, pp121–142.
- 3 JK Holsti, *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1985. See also Holsti, ‘International Relations at the end of the Millennium’, *Review of International Studies*, 19, 1993, pp 401–408.
- 4 S Smith, ‘The discipline of international relations: still an American social science?’, *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 2(3), 2002, pp 374–402; Smith, ‘The United States and the discipline of International Relations: “hegemonic country, hegemonic discipline”’, *International Studies Review*, 4(2), 2002, pp 67–85; O Waever, ‘The sociology of a not so international discipline: American and European developments in International Relations’, *International Organization*, 52(4), 1998, pp 687–727; Waever, ‘Still a discipline after all these debates?’, in T Dunne, M. Kurki & S Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007; and RA Crawford & DS Jarvis (eds), *International Relations—Still an American Social Science? Toward Diversity in International Thought*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2001. See also M Kahler, ‘International Relations: still an American social science?’, in L Miller and M Smith, *Ideas and Ideals: Essays on Politics in Honor of Stanley Hoffmann*, 1993, pp 395–414.
- 5 Smith, ‘The United States and the discipline of International Relations’, pp 67–68.
- 6 Waever, ‘The sociology of a not so international discipline’.
- 7 *Ibid*; and S Smith, *International Relations: British and American Perspectives*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- 8 K Booth, ‘75 years on: rewriting the subject’s past—reinventing its future’, in S Smith, K Booth & M Zalewski (eds), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p 330.
- 9 Some of the contributions were published in a special section of the *International Studies Review*, edited by JA Tickner & AP Tsygankov 2008 (see note 15); and P Bilgin ‘Thinking past “Western” IR?’, *Third World Quarterly*, 29(1), pp 5–23.
- 10 With ‘Pater Realism’, ‘Mater Liberalism’, ‘Caretaking Daughters: Neoliberalism, Liberal Feminism, and Standpoint Feminism’, ‘Bastard Heir: Neoliberalism’ who live ‘Upstairs’; ‘Rebel Sons: Marxism, Gramscian IPE, Postmodern IR, Constructivism–Pragmatism’, ‘Fallen Daughters: Postmodern Feminism and Queer Studies’, who live ‘On the Borders, Downstairs’; ‘Native Informant Servants: Area Studies and Comparative Politics Experts’, ‘Bastard Twins: Peripheral and Transitional Economies’, who live ‘On the Borders, Downstairs’; and ‘Love Child No 1: Orientalism’, ‘Bastard Terrorist: Al Qaida’ and Love Child No 2: Postcolonial IR, who live ‘Outside the House’. AM

- Agathangelou & LHM Ling, 'The house of IR: from family power politics to the poises of worldism', *International Studies Review*, 6, 2004, p 21.
- 11 P Drulák (ed), 'International Relations (IR) in Central and Eastern Europe', Special Forum Section of the *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 12, 2009.
 - 12 HO Breitenbauch & A Wivel, 2004. 'Understanding national IR disciplines outside the United States: political culture and the construction of International Relations in Denmark', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 7(4), 2004, pp 414–443; J Friedrichs 'International Relations theory in France', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 4(2), 2001, pp 118–137; X Huang, 'The invisible hand: modern studies of international relations in Japan, China, and Korea', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 10(2), 2007, pp 168–203; E Jorgensen, 'Towards a six continents social science: International Relations', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 6(4), 2003, pp 330–343; S Lucarelli & R Menotti, 'No-constructivists' land: International Relations in Italy in the 1990s', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 5(2), 2002, pp 114–142; and H Stritzel, 'European approaches to International Relations theory: a house with many mansions', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 8(1), 2005, pp 88–91.
 - 13 S Chan, SPG Mandaville & R Bleiker (eds), *The Zen of International Relations*, London: Palgrave, 2001; N Inayatullah & DL Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, London: Routledge, 2004; and BG Jones (ed), *Decolonizing International Relations*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
 - 14 See, for example, CS Jones (ed), 'Locating the "I" in "IR": dislocating Euro-American theories', *Global Society*, 17(2), special issue, 2002; JA Tickner & AP Tsygankov (eds), 'Responsible scholarship in International Relations: a symposium', *International Studies Review*, 10(4), special issue, 2008; and JP Huysmans & O Waeber (eds), 'International political sociology: beyond European and North American traditions of social and political thought', *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), special issue, 2009.
 - 15 B Korany, 'Strategic studies and the third world: a critical evaluation', *International Social Science Journal*, 38(4), 1986, pp 547–562; Korany 'National security in the Arab world: the persistence of dualism', in D Tschirgi (ed), *The Arab World Today*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994; TJ Biersteker, 'Eroding boundaries, contested terrain', *International Studies Review*, 1(1), 1999, pp 3–9; and Alker & Biersteker, 'The dialectics of world order'.
 - 16 In the spirit of disclosure, let me note that I have been a part of Tickner & Waeber's 'geocultural epistemologies' project since 2004 and have authored a chapter on security thinking in the Arab World and Turkey, forthcoming in Volume 2. I have also written an article, prepared for Mustapha Kamal's Pasha's ISA panel cited above, that came out in *Third World Quarterly*. That article reflected on efforts to re-think the state of 'the field' in different parts of the world. Bilgin, 'Thinking past "Western" IR?'.
 - 17 M Wight, 'Why is there no International Theory?', *International Relations*, 2(1), 1960, p 35.
 - 18 C Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.
 - 19 RBJ Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
 - 20 RW Cox, 'Social forces, states and world orders: beyond International Relations theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 1981, pp 126–155.
 - 21 As Behera explains in the volume under review, in Southeast Asia this is not always because of a desire to put some distance between scholarship and power. Acharya (in Behera, p 80) maintains that it is 'the "proximity of power" enjoyed by academics in the region [that]. . .inhibits the need for, and interest in, theoretical work'. Inoguchi (in Acharya & Buzan) maintains that, in the Japanese context, it is power's interest in IR that has caused scholars to relocate to the humanities.
 - 22 EW Said, 'Travelling theory', in *The Edward Said Reader*, ed M Bayoumi & A Rubin, New York: Vintage Books, 2000.
 - 23 It is worth emphasising that at the time rationalism had not yet come to 'discipline the discipline', to quote Booth, '75 years on', p 328, and the field was much more interdisciplinary. Susan Strange, in her 1995 ISA presidential lecture, reminisced how, in the 1970s, she modelled BISA after ISA, admiring its 'democratic, open, competitive' and interdisciplinary character, as opposed to the then closed and closely monitored field in Britain. Twenty years on, she lamented disciplinary IR's dominance of the study of the international. S Strange, '1995 Presidential Address: ISA as a microcosm', *International Studies Quarterly*, 39, 1995, pp 289–295.
 - 24 D Maliniak, A Oakes, S Peterson & MJ Tierney, 'The view from the ivory tower: TRIP survey of international relations faculty in the United States and Canada', Program on the Theory and Practice of International Relations, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA, 2007.
 - 25 Including the USA, Biersteker reminds us. See also Maliniak *et al*, 'The view from the ivory tower'.
 - 26 I have developed this argument in Bilgin, 'Thinking past "Western" IR?'.

- 27 This is not to deny the significance of factors such as socialisation of scholars into American IR during their training; the adoption of US practices of measuring scholarly success outside the US; and the traumas of colonialism and beyond.
- 28 Exceptionalism, Acharya reminds (in Behera) is 'vulnerable to governmental abuse'—as witnessed in the 'Asian values' debate of the 1990s.
- 29 Yet calls for local schools of IR also serve as a tool for claiming cultural authenticity (see the chapter on Turkey in Tickner & Waeber). Acharya warns against such a stance for, he reminds the reader, it may serve the purposes of conservatives, as a 'powerful tool to resist change' (Acharya in Behera, p 82). Hence the significance of studying non-Western IR not only in terms of the 'job description' of theory (as explanation and/or understanding) but also for what it allows actors to *do* in domestic/international and academic political realms.
- 30 See also H Muppidi, *The Politics of the Global, Borderlines*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2004; and S Krishna, *Postcolonial Insecurities: India, Sri Lanka, and the Question of Nationhood*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- 31 Walker, *Inside/Outside*; and MC Williams, 'Identity and the politics of security', *European Journal of International Relations*, 4(2), 1998, pp 204–225.
- 32 Cox, 'Social forces, states and world orders'.

Notes on contributor

Pinar Bilgin is an associate professor of international relations at Bilkent University, Ankara. She is the author of *Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective* (2005). Her most recent articles have been published in the *European Journal of Political Research*, *Political Geography*, *Security Dialogue* and *Third World Quarterly*. Her research focuses on critical approaches to the study and practice of security with a specific focus on the developing world. Further information is available at www.bilkent.edu.tr/~pbilgin.